

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the Application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner objects to Claim 12 because at line 1, the word "and" should be deleted. The only occurrence of the word "and" on line 1 between the words "... a plurality of scan lines and a plurality of signal lines..." between lines 1 and 2 of Claim 12. Applicants submit that without the word "and" the phrase would read "...a plurality of scan lines a plurality of signal lines...", which would not be clear. The way lines 1-2 were are currently worded, the matrix form comprise a plurality of scan lines and a plurality of signal lines, and those skilled in the art understand that two sets of lines are required to form the matrix. The Examiner's requested change on line 2 has been made. However, the Examiner states that the word "said" should be inserted before "display" on line 3. The text on lines 2-3 recite "...one display element...". Since there is no antecedent basis on lines 1-2 for the term "display element", Applicants do not see how the word "said" would be appropriate here. The Examiner requested changes on lines 8 and 9 have been made.

With respect to Claim 14, the Examiner's requested change has been made. The Examiner's proposed changes to Claim 17 have been made as have the changes to Claim 19. With respect to Claim 21, the Examiner wants to replace the term "a scan line" on line 2 with --each of said scan lines--. If Applicants comply with the Examiner's request, the pertinent apportion of line 2 would read "...scan line buffer circuits each coupling each of said scan lines to the reduced...". This would require that each of the scan line buffer circuits couple each of the scan lines to reduce voltage source. Clearly this is not correct in not consistent with the present application. Applicants have amended Claim 21 to recite that the scan line buffer circuits each couple one of the scan lines to a reduced voltage source, which is consistent with the present application.

The Examiner's proposed changes to Claim 22 have been implemented substituting "the" for "said".

The Examiner rejects Claims 16 and 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regard as the invention. The Examiner states that in Claim 16, the "the matrix" on line 2 has no antecedent basis. This term has been changed to --dot matrix display--. Regarding Claims 23-26, these claims recite the term "the reference potential" which the Examiner states has insufficient antecedent basis. The term "the" has been changed to --a--.

The Examiner rejects Claims 12, 16, 18, 21-24, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by applicants admitted prior art. The Examiner interprets the prior art such that the first column of the display could function as the present invention. There are no timing diagrams for the prior art described in the application, but there is nothing to suggest that timing diagrams are different from that in Figure 3, except for the signal SG. It should be noted that the signals SF0, SF1, SF2 and SF3 all start at the same time. Therefore, if the first column of the display which is activated by the signal SF0, it would be utilized to remove the charge, it would be doing so when the other columns SF1, SF2 and SF3 are all active. As clearly shown by the signal SG of the present invention, the present invention discharges the stored charge at a time just before these signals become active, so the signal SF0 could not function for this purpose. Claim 12 has been amended in this respect. According, Applicants believe that the application is clearly distinguished over applicant's admitted prior art.

The Examiner objects to Claims 17 and 19 as being dependent upon or rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, if the above objections were overcome. The Examiner states that claim 25 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have placed Claim 17 in independent form as suggested by the Examiner. Claims 19 and 25 are dependent upon Claim 17 and thus should also be allowable.

The Examiner has withdrawn his objections Figure 2A and the proposed figure is approved. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the brief description of the drawings herewith.

An Information Disclosure Statement is enclosed herewith. It is clear from the English language abstract of the Japanese patent publication that each scan line is discharged after the elements attached to that scan line have been activated. Accordingly, the claims in the present application are clearly distinguished therefrom.

Applicants believe the Application, as amended, is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has further questions concerning his objections to the claims or his '112 rejections of the claims, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

Texas Instruments Incorporated

By


William B. Kempier
Senior Corporate Patent Counsel
Reg. No. 28,228
Tel.: (972) 917-5452